

### Remarks

Entrance of this amendment and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-6, 9-11, 13, 16-21, 23-27, 29-32, 35-37, 39, 42-47, 49-54, 56-59, 62-64, 66, 69-74 & 76-79 remain pending.

By this paper, independent claims 1, 27, 53 & 54 are amended to more clearly point out and distinctly claims certain aspects of the present invention. These amendments are submitted in a *bona fide* attempt to further prosecution of this application. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application as filed. For example, reference FIGS. 3 & 9-13 of the application, as well as the supporting discussion thereof, and the subject matter of the canceled dependent claims. Claims 2, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 22, 28, 33, 34, 38, 40, 41, 48, 55, 60, 61, 65, 67, 68 & 75 are canceled herein without prejudice. The subject matter of these claims is believed well covered by the remaining pending claims.

In the Office Action, original claims 1, 13-17, 21, 23, 26-27, 39-43, 47, 49, 52-54, 66-70, 74, 76 & 79 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Makower et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.: US 2002/0184507 A1; hereinafter Makower), while claims 2-12, 18-20, 22, 24-25, 28-38, 44-46, 48, 50-51, 55-65, 71-73, 75, 77 & 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Makower as applied to claims 1, 27 & 54, and further in view of Loisey et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.: US 2002/0133330 A1; hereinafter Loisey). These rejections are respectfully, but most strenuously, traversed to any extent deemed applicable to the amended claims presented herewith, and reconsideration thereof is requested.

Initially, Applicants note that independent claims 1, 27, 53 & 54 submitted herewith, respectively recite certain subject matter of original dependent claims 2, 7, 8, 28, 33, 34, 55, 60 & 61. Since the subject matter of these dependent claims was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Makower in view of Loisey, it is submitted that the originally stated 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of the prior independent claims based on Makower is moot. Thus, the comments which follow are directed to the non-obviousness of Applicants' invention relative to Makower in view of Loisey.

An “obviousness” determination requires an evaluation of whether the prior art taken as a whole would suggest the claimed invention taken as a whole to one of ordinary skill in the art. In evaluating claimed subject matter as a whole, the Federal Circuit has expressly mandated that functional claim language be considered in evaluating a claim relative to the prior art.

As presented herewith, Applicants claim an authentication identity translation method which includes: establishing an authenticated user identity at an initial server responsive to an identification and authentication event within a domain comprising the initial server and at least one subsequent server, the identification and authentication event occurring at the initial server, the initial server and the at least one subsequent server each employing disparate user registries with different user identities, the disparate user registries being separately maintained by the servers *and being logically represented in a global registry maintained by a domain controller, the global registry including information that establishes a correspondence between a user identity in the initial server with a corresponding, local user identity within the at least one subsequent server*; generating a translation token representative of the identification and authentication event, and providing the translation token to the domain controller, storing the translation token by the domain controller and obtaining a token reference from the domain controller, the token reference comprising an index to the stored translation token within the domain controller; forwarding the token reference from the initial server to the at least one subsequent server along with a request; and translating the authenticated user identity of the initial server to a local user identity of the at least one subsequent server, wherein the at least one subsequent server initiates the translating employing the token reference received from the initial server. In Applicants’ recited approach, the translating further includes *forwarding the token reference from the at least one subsequent server to the domain controller, and employing the token reference at the domain controller to retrieve the translation token and translate the authenticated user identity of the initial server to the local user identity of the at least one subsequent server employing the global registry of the corresponding user identities maintained by the domain controller.*

Applicants respectfully submit that at least the functionality of logically representing in a global registry maintained by a domain controller the disparate user registries separately maintained by the servers of the domain, wherein the information in the global registry establishes a correspondence between a user identity in the initial server and a corresponding, local user identity within the at least one subsequent server is unique to the present invention.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the processing of generating a translation token representative of the identification and authentication event, and then storing that translation token by the domain controller and receiving in return a token reference which is then forwarded with a request from the initial server to the at least one subsequent server, is unique. Still further, Applicants respectfully submit that their recited processing of translating the authenticated user identity of the initial server to a local user identity of the at least one subsequent server *per se* is unique, and in particular, that the recited process for translating using the token reference and the stored translation token at the domain controller, along with the global registry, is unique.

Makower describes a centralized single sign-on method and system for a client server environment. A single sign-on protocol for use by web servers is independent of the actual authentication mechanism used by any of the individual web servers accessed by the user. Users authenticate themselves with any one of a group of federated servers so that a user does not need to be re-authenticated by servers in the federation. In a preferred implementation of Makower, there is also a centralized server that provides for the transparent sign-on, session management, and session termination within each server in the federation of servers, and each federated server communicates with a central sign-on server. (See Abstract of Makower.)

Initially, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion of numerous aspects of their above-summarized process for authenticated identity translation. For example, a careful reading of Makower fails to uncover any discussion of a domain wherein disparate user registries are separately maintained by the servers and are logically represented in a global registry maintained by a controller, wherein the global registry includes information that establishes a correspondence between a user identity in one server and a corresponding, local user identity in another server. Further, a careful reading of Makower fails to uncover any discussion of a facility for generating a translation token representative of the identification

authentication event, providing the translation token to the domain controller, storing the translation token by the domain controller and obtaining a token reference from the domain controller, which is an index to the translation token within the domain controller, and then forwarding the token reference from the initial server to the at least one subsequent server along with a request. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the discussion in paragraph [0039] of Makower, cited in the Office Action with respect to the subject matter of original claims 7, 33 & 60, is simply not relevant to the processing recited by Applicants. Makower is describing a central sign-on server, which is a different process from that recited by Applicants.

Still further, Applicants recite translating using the authenticated user identity of the initial server to a corresponding local user identity of the at least one subsequent server. A specific approach for performing the translation using the token reference and the translation token is recited in independent claims 1, 27 & 54.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Makower does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention as recited in the independent claims. The initial Office Action recognized that Makower did not teach or suggest the particular aspects of Applicants' invention set forth in original dependent claims 2, 7, 8, 28, 33, 24, 55, 60 & 61. For a teaching of these aspects, the Office Action relied upon Loisey. The relevancy of Loisey to Applicants' above-recited processing is respectfully traversed.

Loisey describes a system and method for allowing user access to software applications, data storage retrieval, and electronic mail and messaging services in a network computing environment. The need for software installation, upgrade, and version control, and the need for certain hardware upgrades are eliminated by proving software and data storage and retrieval to a user or groups of users from a remote terminal server via a networked computing environment. Software applications, data and electronic mail and messages services are stored, maintained and operated at a remote terminal server and are provided to the user over the internet or over an intranet of an organization such as a company or educational institution. Data is stored and secured at a remote file server, and web operations are provided by a remote web server. The backend of the system, including the terminal servers, file servers and web servers is managed and secured by a domain controller. (See Abstract of Loisey.)

In the Office Action, certain of the subject matter recited in the independent claims presented herewith was rejected as being taught, for example, in paragraphs [0022], [0058], [0059], [0066] – [0068] of Loisey. These paragraph citations to Loisey are respectfully traversed to any extent deemed applicable to the processing recited by Applicants in the independent claims presented. A careful reading of Loisey, and in particular, the noted paragraphs, fails to uncover any discussion relevant the processing of Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that considering the processing or functional claim language recited by Applicants, the independent claims submitted herewith patentably distinguish over Loisey and Makower.


For example, paragraph [0022] of Loisey does not discuss any functionality similar to Applicants' claimed invention. Paragraph [0066] of Loisey discusses proper authentication of a user by matching the provided information to information maintained by the domain controller. This could be referring to, for example, comparing a password that is stored within the domain controller. This paragraph does not, however, describe a domain wherein servers maintain disparate registries with different user identities, and wherein there is a domain controller which has a logical representation in a global registry of the disparate user registries, and which is used to translate from, for example, an authenticated user identity of an initial server to a corresponding, local user identity of another server in the domain. Further, the remaining cited paragraphs of Loisey provide no discussion of identity translation as recited in the claims presented herewith.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections to the independent claims presented. The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional characterizations.

All pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, Applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone him at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin P. Radigan, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 31,789

Dated: November 08, 2005.

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.  
5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, New York 12203-5160  
Telephone: (518) 452-5600  
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579